



Soco Transmission &lt;socotransmission@gmail.com&gt;

## New Comment Submission

EDAW Engage &lt;info@engage.edaw.com&gt;

Mon, Aug 31, 2009 at 2:42 AM

To: info@socotransmission.com, dennis.rankin@wdc.usda.gov, douglas.johnston@aecom.com

A new comment has been submitted at [socotransmission.com](http://www.socotransmission.com).

### COMMENT

Meeting Attended:  
 Alamosa Scoping Meeting

Important Issues:  
 Radio or Television Interference, Noise, Health and Safety, Project Purpose and Need, Visual / Aesthetic Resources, Proximity to Residences

Property Uses:  
 Agriculture, Residential

Comment:  
 As a stakeholder in this process, my land and residence being in one of the corridors considered for placement of the line, I have several considerations I would hope to see addressed before the approval of this line goes through. I will attempt to categorize these comments.

#### General comments:

- I-123-001** 1.Meeting type – Having only open house style meetings does not work well! It would be better to have part of the meeting as a presentation with public question and answers and afterward have time for the open house style. The first public scoping meetings were held in this format. Please return to it.
- I-123-002** 2.Updated maps – The photographic maps I looked out were not accurate to conditions currently on the ground. Three residences in my area, including my own, were not on the photos!! This is a very inaccurate portrayal of the area and should not be used in planning line locations.
- I-123-003** 3.Purpose of the line – The differences in reasons given for the purpose of need for this transmission line only leads to distrust by the public. Solar companies such as Sun Edison and Tessara solar will openly say that the purpose of the line is to support solar development in the Valley and this seems to be clearly supported by the need to fulfill state renewable energy mandates and the transcripts from the recent PUC hearing for permitting of the line. Meanwhile, Tri-State, Excel and SLVREC continue to say that the line has NOTHING to do with solar development in the SLV, as was recently quoted to me. We need to have a honest dialog about this line to insure that decision made will be in the best long-term interest of the SLV and the state of Colorado.

#### Line comments:

- I-123-004** 1.Migratory bird flyways – a lot of people do not realize that there are a lot of migratory birds flying east-west every day between farm fields to the west of Hwy. 17 and the Blanca Wetlands. Living in this corridor, I can tell you there are an incredible number of Sandhill Cranes flying east in the evening and back west in the morning to feed on the farm fields. From my observations they generally fly approximately 30 -100 ft. above the ground. This puts them directly in the path of the line.
- 2.Type of towers used and color – Two types of towers being considered, single steel poles and lattice type towers. From my observations, I feel that the single steel poles are much less intrusive in the view shed than the lattice type, which seem to be more visible from miles away. The other consideration here is the color of the steel poles. I have seen them in at least five different colors around the Colorado Springs area. My recommendation would be for Tri-State to hire a consultant to come up with the least intrusive color to match the dominant background the majority of the year. Once again trying to protect the view shed as much as possible.

<http://mail.google.com/mail/?ui=2&ik=760671f559&view=pt&search=inbox&msg=1236f...> 8/31/2009

### I-123-001: Public Involvement Process (In Review)

Your email/letter/comment form has been received and your comment noted. The project is in the planning and environmental review stages. Current project information will be available on the RUS project website, <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/ea.htm> and the Utilities' project website, <http://www.socotransmission.com/>.

The Environmental Impact Statement is anticipated to be completed in late 2010 and will be available at <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/ea.htm>.

### I-123-002: Correction to Data (In Review)

Your email/letter/comment form has been received and your comment noted. The information you provided will be verified and project materials will be updated accordingly.

The Environmental Impact Statement is anticipated to be completed in late 2010 and will be available at <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/ea.htm>.

### I-123-003: Purpose and Need (In Review)

Your email/letter/comment form has been received and your comment noted. Project purpose and need will be addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement.

The Environmental Impact Statement is anticipated to be completed in late 2010 and will be available at <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/ea.htm>.

### I-123-004: Wildlife (In Review)

Your email/letter/comment form has been received and your comment noted. Potential impacts to wildlife from the proposed project and mitigation measures will be addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement.

The Environmental Impact Statement is anticipated to be completed in

I-123-005

3.Distance from residences – Given the issues of EMF, noise, radio/tv/cell phone interference and property value loss, this is by far the most important consideration and , I think, should be a major governing factor in the placement of the line. Through much of the valley it should be possible to keep the line at least ½ mile away from any residence. For instance, if the line parallels County Road 112 going north from Alamosa, it could be kept in the far east side of that corridor, thus avoiding close proximity(less that ½ mile) to residences.

4.For corridors running north from roughly Hwy 160 toward Mosca, why are only Hwy 17 and County Road 112 being looked at? Why not move the line further East along County Road 114 or 116? These areas are much less populated than areas to the west closer to Hwy 17.

5.If County Rd. 112 is seriously being looked at as a potential for the line, it needs to be kept as far East in that corridor as possible. This will help keep greater distance from residences in the area along road 112, most of which are on the west side of the road. Previously, the view shed to the East with the Sangre De Cristo range was a priority, but in light of the other option of running the line at a diagonal NW from the intersection of Cty. Rd. 112 and Cty. Rd. 2 S, keeping the line as far East in the Cty. Rd. 112 corridor WOULD BE PERFERABLE.

Thank You,  
Mark Johnson  
1091 Rd 112 S.  
Alamosa, CO. 81101  
(719) 588-2071

#### CONTACT INFORMATION

Name: Mark Johnson  
Representing: Stakeholders along Cty. Rd 112, Alamosa  
Mailing Address: 1091 Rd. 112 S.  
City: Alamosa  
State: CO  
Zip Code: 81101  
Phone Number: 719-588-2071  
Email Address: [marktj@hotmail.com](mailto:marktj@hotmail.com)  
Receive Newsletter: on

late 2010 and will be available at  
<http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/ea.htm>.

#### I-123-005: Project Alternatives (In Review)

Your email/letter/comment from has been received and your comment noted. A range of reasonable project alternatives and mitigation measures including the no action alternative will be addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement.

The Environmental Impact Statement is anticipated to be completed in late 2010 and will be available at  
<http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/ea.htm>.